

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The non-final Office Action of February 4, 2009, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 4, 6, 10, 13, 15, and 17 have been amended to place the claims in a more preferred form. Claims 5, 8-9, and 19 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 20 has been added. Thus, claims 4, 6-7, 10-18, and 20 are pending.

Claims 4-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. App. 2003/0191799 to Araujo et al. (hereinafter referred to as "*Araujo*"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants have amended independent claim 4 to include features of dependent claim 9 and additional features. No new matter has been added. Support for these features can at least be found in [0052] – [0056] of Applicants' original specification where support for dependent claim 9 also may be found. Amended independent claim 4 recites, among other features,

at least one access server resident in the point of presence node, wherein the at least one access server comprises a virtual private network module configured to implement a secure communication channel between the remote computing client and the at least one server in the at least one target communication network,

wherein the remote computing client comprises a virtual private network module configured to cooperate with the virtual private network module resident in the point of presence node,

wherein the virtual private network module in the remote computing client and the virtual private module in the at least one access server are configured to establish an encrypted communication channel between a specific application executing on the remote computing client and the point of presence node,

wherein the virtual private network module in the remote computing client is configured to:

generate a first encryption data set comprising a public portion and a private portion, and

transmit the public portion of the first encryption data set to the virtual private network module in the at least one access server in a first session set-up message,

wherein the virtual private network module in the at least one access server is configured to:

receive the public portion of the first encryption data set in the first session set-up message,

generate a second encryption data set corresponding to the first session set-up message, the second encryption data set comprising a public portion and a private portion,

encrypt the public portion of the second encryption data set with a private key of the at least one access server, and
transmit the encrypted public portion of the second encryption data set in a second session set-up message,
wherein the virtual private network module in the remote computing client further is configured to:
receive the encrypted public portion of the second encryption data set in the second session set-up message,
decrypt the encrypted public portion of the second encryption data set, and
if decryption is successful, establish a session between the virtual private network module in the remote computing client and the virtual private network module in the at least one access server.

At best, *Araujo* describes encrypted communications between a virtual office server and a remote client where the encrypted communications is provided through conventional secure sockets layer (SSL) capability supported within a user browser. *Araujo* fails to teach or suggest any description of public portion encryption, public portion transmission, or public portion decryption. *Araujo* is deficient for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as each and every feature of Applicants' claim 4 is not taught or suggested by *Araujo*. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants' claims 4, 6-7, and 10-18, which depend from claim 4, are allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein. Applicants' new claim 20 includes similar features as recited in Applicants' independent claim 4. *Araujo* similarly fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' claim 20.

CONCLUSION

All matters having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below. Applicants look forward to passage to issue of the present application at the earliest convenience of the Office.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 22nd day December, 2009

By: /John M. Fleming/
John M. Fleming
Registration No. 56,536

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001